UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,229	11/12/2003	Andrew L. Van Brocklin	200309795-1	8482

22879 7590 12/07/2006

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
DHARIA, PRABODH M	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2629	

DATE MAILED: 12/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/712,229	VAN BROCKLIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Prabodh M. Dharia	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 November 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *14-44* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *12 November 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. **Status:** Please all the replies and correspondence should be addressed to examiner's new art unit 2629. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted on 11-01-2006 under election of Group I (Claims 1-13) without traverse, which have been placed of record in the file. Claims 1-13 are pending in this action. Claims 14-44 are withdrawn from consideration.

Response to Amendment

The amendment filed 11-01-2006 does not introduces new matter into the disclosure. The added material which is supported by the original disclosure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3,12,13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthies et al. (US 2005/0078104 A1) in view of Hayashi et al. (6,359,666 B1).

Regarding Claim 1, Mathis et al. teaches a large area display (page 1, paragraph 2, page 3, paragraph 75, page 4, paragraphs 75,76, 78, 80, page 8, paragraph 116,120, page 9, paragraph 121,122) comprising: a pixel layer including display elements (page 3,4, paragraph 75); a connection layer (page 4, paragraph 76, Lines 1-11 paragraph 78); drivers in communication with the pixel layer and the connection layer (page 4, paragraph 78), the drivers configured for

driving the display elements in the pixel layer and configured for communicating through the connection layer (page 4, paragraph 78, paragraph 80, Lines 1-10); and a laminate formed (page 8, paragraphs 120, Lines 10-13) of the pixel layer, the connection layer and drivers (page 8, paragraphs 116, 120, pages 8,9, paragraph 121) comprising the large area display (page 3, paragraph 71, Lines 1-5). However, Mathis et al. fails to recite or disclose a pixel layer having a repeating pattern of sub-displays formed on a continuous pixel layer sheet, and a connection layer in communication with the drivers having a continuous sheet with conductive traces for distributing power and data to the drivers wherein the pixel layer, the connection layer and the drivers are laminated together to form the large area display. However, Hayashi et al. discloses a pixel layer having a repeating pattern (Col. 1, Lines 49-61, Col. 2, Lines 60-67, Col. 6, Lines 61-67) of sub-displays formed on a continuous pixel layer sheet (Col. 6, Lines 61-67), and a connection layer in communication with the drivers having a continuous sheet (substrate) with conductive traces for distributing power and data to the drivers wherein the pixel layer (Col. 4, Line 55 to Col. 5, Line 2, Col. 6, lines 6-8, Col. 7, Lines 29-37) the connection layer and the drivers are laminated together to form the large area display (see figure 5, Col. 6, Lines 61-67, Col. 5, Lines 3-27, Col. 9, Lines 10-21).

The reason to combine teaching of Hayashi et al. with teaching of Matthis et al. teaching of large area LCD tiled base is Hayashi et al. teaches large LCD display formed with repeating pattern of Pixels, and novel structure of wiring such as signal lines scanning lines and pixel electrodes formed on an array substrate (single sheet).

Thus it is obvious to one in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate teaching of Hayashi et al. in teaching of Matthis et al. to able to have a large area

display with active matrix or passive matrix organization, as well as TFT driver for pixels with novel structure of wiring such as signal lines scanning lines and pixel electrodes formed on an array substrate (single sheet) without causing the unevenness of combined images.

Regarding Claim 2, Mathis et al. teaches the drivers are laminated between the pixel layer and the connection layer (item # 510,512,514, 516, 520,522,524, see figure 5, pages 8,9, paragraphs 120,121).

Regarding Claim 3, Mathis et al. teaches the display elements comprises at least one of liquid crystal display (LCD), light emitting diode (LED), organic LED (OLED), polymer light emitting device (PLED), electroluminescent (EL), electrophoretic display, electrochromic display, electrowetting, gas plasma and fiber plasma (page 3, paragraph 70).

Regarding Claim 12, Mathis et al. teaches the drivers further comprise: serial data input for receiving display data (see figures 6,12, page 11, paragraph 140, Lines 13-16 a single line receiving serial data to each tile of display); and serial data output (page 11, paragraph 139, Lines 11-23, receive pixel data stored in the memory and outputted serially on a single line) for sensing and testing (pages 6, paragraphs 102, 103, page 7, paragraphs 103-108) and the connection layer comprises a first conductive layer for providing power and ground connections to driver electronics (page 9, paragraph 122, page 11, paragraph 139, Lines 11-14, paragraph 140, Lines 13-16).

Regarding Claim 13, Mathis et al. teaches an input/output (I/O) connector in communication with the connection layer configured for external communication (see figure 12, page 9, paragraphs 122).

4. Claims 4-8 and 10, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthies et al. (US 2005/0078104 A1) in view of Hayashi et al. (6,359,666 B1) as applied to claims 1-3,12,13 above, and further in view of Salerno et al. (5,396,304).

Regarding Claim 4,5,6,7,8,10, Mathis et al. further teaches a large area display (page 1, paragraph 2, page 3, paragraph 75, page 4, paragraphs 75,76, 78, 80, page 8, paragraph 116,120, page 9, paragraph 121,122); the connection layer comprises a first conductive layer for providing power and ground connections to driver electronics (page 9, paragraph 122) and large area liquid crystal display (LCD, page 3, paragraph 70, Lines 5-11).

However, Mathis et al. modified by Hayashi et al. fails to recite and disclose the pixel layer comprises an active matrix display; the pixel layer comprises a passive matrix display; the pixel layer comprises at least one transistor per pixel; each of the at least one transistors comprises a thin film transistor (TFT); the drivers comprise complementary metal on semiconductor (CMOS) circuitry on silicon or glass substrates.

Salerno et al. teaches the pixel layer comprises an active matrix display (Col. 48, Lines 6-9); the pixel layer comprises a passive matrix display (Col. 48, Lines 9-12); the pixel layer comprises at least one transistor per pixel (Col. 15, Lines 31,32); each of the at least one transistors comprises a thin film transistor (TFT) (Col. 44, Lines 31-33); the drivers comprise

complementary metal on semiconductor (CMOS) circuitry on silicon or glass substrates (Col. 44, Lines 60-68, Col. 2, lines 5-20); the drivers further comprise: serial data input for receiving display data; and serial data output for sensing and testing for light intensity transmitted through each light valve (Col. 35, Lines 49-65).

The reason to combine teaching of Salerno et al. with teaching of Matthis et al. teaching of large area LCD to overcome problem of amorphous silicon TFT's lack of needed frequency response in the large area high resolution LCD display technology.

Thus it is obvious to one in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate teaching Salerno et al. of in teaching of Mathis et al. modified by Hayashi et al. to able to have a large area display with active matrix or passive matrix organization, as well as TFT driver for pixels with CMOS low power technology to produce highly defined color images.

5. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthies et al. (US 2005/0078104 A1) in view of Hayashi et al. (6,359,666 B1) as applied to claims 1-3,12,13 above, and further in view of Yoshii et al. (6,147,724).

Regarding Claim 9, Matthis et al. further teaches a large area display (page 1, paragraph 2, page 3, paragraph 75, page 4, paragraphs 75,76, 78, 80, page 8, paragraph 116,120, page 9, paragraph 121,122); the connection layer comprises a first conductive layer for providing power and ground connections to driver electronics (page 9, paragraph 122) and large area LCD; liquid crystal display (page 3, paragraph 70, Lines 5-11).

However, Mathis et al. modified by Hayashi et al. fails to recite and disclose low voltage differential signaling (LVDS) logic for data transmission.

Yoshii et al. teaches the low voltage differential signaling (LVDS) logic for data transmission (Col. 25, Lines 20-52) and large area portable LCD; liquid crystal display (Col. 8, Lines 31-36).

The reason to combine teaching of Yoshii et al. with teaching of Matthis et al. teaching of large area LCD to reduce EMI, better ESD tolerance and noise tolerance for high speed serial data transfer in the large area high resolution LCD display technology.

Thus it is obvious to one in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate teaching Yoshii et al. of in teaching of Mathis et al. modified by Hayashi et al. to able to have a highly defined color images large area display with active matrix or passive matrix organization, as well as TFT driver for pixels with LVDS technology serially receiving high speed data with reduce EMI, better ESD tolerance and noise tolerance.

6. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthies et al. (US 2005/0078104 A1) in view of Hayashi et al. (6,359,666 B1) as applied to claims 1-3,12,13 above, and further in view of Albert et al. (US 2005/0007336 A1).

Regarding Claim 11, Mathis et al. teaches a large area display (page 1, paragraph 2, page 3, paragraph 75, page 4, paragraphs 75,76, 78, 80, page 8, paragraph 116,120, page 9, paragraph 121,122); the connection layer comprises a first conductive layer for providing power and

ground connections to driver electronics (page 9, paragraph 122) and large area bi-stable (electrophoretic) display (page 3, paragraph 70, Lines 5-11).

However, Mathis et al. modified by Hayashi et al. fails to recite and disclose the drivers comprise complementary metal on semiconductor (CMOS) circuitry on plastic substrates.

Albert et al. teaches the drivers comprise complementary metal on semiconductor (CMOS) (page 10, paragraph 102, Lines 1-4) circuitry on plastic substrates (page 4, paragraph 43, Lines 6-11) for a large area bi-stable (electrophoretic) display (page 9, paragraph 93, Lines 1-4).

The reason to combine teaching of Albert et al. with Mathis et al. teaching of bi-stable (electrophoretic) display to be able to bend or roll a portable large area display.

Thus it is obvious to one in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate teaching Salerno et al. of in teaching of Mathis et al. modified by Hayashi et al. to able to have a large area display with organized, on plastic substrate with CMOS low power driver technology to produce a flexible large area display.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments, see remark, filed on 11-01-2006, with respect to the amendments to claim1 have been fully considered and are persuasive. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Hayashi et al. (US 6,359,666 B1).

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prabodh M. Dharia whose telephone number is 571-272-7668. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8AM to 5PM.

10. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

PD

AU2629

November 30, 2006

BIPIN SHALWALA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600